DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 216 TM 860 083

AUTHOR Drasgow, Fritz; Levine, Michael V.
TITLE Optimal Detection of Inappropriate Test Scores.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Model Based Measurement Lab.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Naval Research, Arlington, Va. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office.
PUB DATE Jun 85
GRANT N00014-79C-0752; N00014-83K-0397
NOTE 37p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Error of Measurement; *Latent Trait Theory; *Mathematical Models; Maximum Likelihood Statistics; Measurement Techniques; *Multiple Choice Tests; Psychometrics; Response Style (Tests); *Scoring
IDENTIFIERS *Appropriateness Measurement; Optimal Appropriateness Measurement; Polychotomous Scoring; Three Parameter Model

ABSTRACT

Optimal appropriateness indices, recently introduced by Levine and Drasgow (1984), provide the highest rates of detection of aberrant response patterns that can be obtained from item responses. These optimal appropriateness indices are used to study three important problems in appropriateness measurement. First, the maximum detection rates of two particular forms of aberrance are determined for a long unidimensional test. These detection rates are shown to be moderately high. Second, two versions of the standardized "L sub 0" appropriateness index are compared to optimal indices. At low false alarm rates one standardized "L sub 0" index has detection rates that are about 65 percent as large as optimal for spuriously high (cheating) test scores. However, for the spuriously low scores expected from persons with ill-advised testing strategies or reading problems, both standardized "L sub 0" indices are far from optimal. Finally, detection rates for polychotomous and dichotomous scorings of the item responses are compared. It is shown that dichotomous scoring causes serious decreases in the detectability of some aberrant response patterns. Consequently, appropriateness measurement constitutes one practical testing problem where significant gains result from the use of a polychotomous item response model. (Author/LMO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified	1b RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS
2a SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY	3 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release: distribution unlimited
2b DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE	
4 PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) Measurement Series 85-1	5 MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)
6a NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Michael V. Levine Model-Based Measurement Lab. 6b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	7a NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research
6c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) University of Illinois 210 Education Bldg., 1310 S. Sixth St. Champaign, IL 61820	7b ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Code 442PT 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217
8a NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION 8b OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)	9 PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER
8c ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	10 SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM ELEMENT NO: 61153N; PROJECT NO: RR042-04; TASK NO: RR042-04-01; WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO: NR 154-445 NR 150-518
11 TITLE (Include Security Classification) Optimal Detection of Inappropriate Test Scores (unclassified)	
12 PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Drasgow, Fritz and Levine, Michael V.	
13a TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report 13b TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____	14 DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1985, June 15 PAGE COUNT 36
16 SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION	
17 COSATI CODES FIELD / GROUP / SUB-GROUP	18 SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Appropriateness measurement, Optimal appropriateness measurement, Item response theory, Three-parameter logistic model, Polychotomous item response model.

19 ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

Optimal appropriateness indices, recently introduced by Levine and Drasgow (1984), provide the highest rates of detection of aberrant response patterns that can be obtained from item responses. In this article they are used to study three important problems in appropriateness measurement. First, the maximum detection rates of two particular forms of aberrance are determined for a long unidimensional test. These detection rates are shown to be moderately high. Seocnd, two versions of the standardized ℓ_0 appropriateness index are compared to optimal indices. At low false alarm rates one standardized ℓ_0 index has detection rates that are about 65% as large as optimal for spuriously high (cheating) test scores. However, for the spuriously low scores expected from persons with ill-advised testing strategies or reading problems, both standardized ℓ_0 indices are far from optimal. Finally, detection rates for polychotomous and dichotomous scorings of the item responses are compared. It is shown that dichotomous scoring causes serious decreases in the detectability of some aberrant response patterns. Consequently, appropriateness measurement constitutes one practical (cont.)

20 DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☐ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT. ☐ DTIC USERS	21 ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION unclassified
22a NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Michael V. Levine	22b TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 217/333-0092 22c OFFICE SYMBOL

DD FORM 1473, 84 MAR 83 APR edition may be used until exhausted. All other editions are obsol

19. Abstract (continued)

testing problem where significant gains result from the use of a polychotomous item response model.

Optimal Detection of Inappropriate Test Scores

Fritz Drasgow and Michael V. Levine

University of Illinois

Running head: Optimal Appropriateness Measurement

Key Words: Appropriateness measurement

Optimal appropriateness measurement

Item response theory

Three-parameter logistic model

Polychotomous item response model

Abstract

Optimal appropriateness indices, recently introduced by Levine and Drasgow (1984), provide the highest rates of detection of aberrant response patterns that can be obtained from item responses. In this article they are used to study three important problems in appropriateness measurement. First, the maximum detection rates of two particular forms of aberrance are determined for a long unidimensional test. These detection rates are shown to be moderately high. Second, two versions of the standardized ℓ_0 appropriateness index are compared to optimal indices. At low false alarm rates one standardized ℓ_0 index has detection rates that are about 65% as large as optimal for spuriously high (cheating) test scores. However, for the spuriously low scores expected from persons with ill-advised testing strategies or reading problems, both standardized ℓ_0 indices are far from optimal. Finally, detection rates for polychotomous and dichotomous scorings of the item responses are compared. It is shown that dichotomous scoring causes serious decreases in the detectability of some aberrant response patterns. Consequently, appropriateness measurement constitutes one practical testing problem where significant gains result from the use of a polychotomous item response model.

1. Introduction

An examinee's score on a multiple choice test may occasionally fail to provide a representative measure of ability or achievement. Examinees' scores are spuriously high when they copy answers from high ability neighbors or they have been given the answers to some questions by informants. Spuriously low scores result from alignment errors (answering the $(i + 1)$st item in the space provided for the i^{th} answer) over a block of items, atypical educations, unusually creative interpretations of normally easy items, language difficulties, suboptimal omitting strategies, and a variety of other sources.

It is important to detect aberrant response patterns. Test scores that provide unrepresentative measures of abilities can lead to misclassification errors that are expensive to test users. Furthermore, these errors can have profound implications for test takers. Individuals with spuriously high test scores may be selected for jobs or academic programs for which they are incompetent, and spuriously low test scores may cause deserving individuals to be denied professional and academic opportunities.

Levine and Rubin (1979) used the term appropriateness measurement to denote model-based methods for detecting inappropriate test scores. Appropriateness measurement methods usually attempt to identify inconsistent response patterns that have correct answers to difficult items co-occuring with incorrect answers to easy items (Drasgow, 1982; Drasgow, Levine, & Williams, 1985; Harnisch & Tatsuoka, 1983; Levine & Drasgow, 1982; Levine & Rubin, 1979; Rudner, 1983; Tatsuoka, 1984). Such response patterns are expected to result from the types of test-taking anomalies described above.

Review of Previous Research

Simulated spuriously high and spuriously low response patterns have been shown to be detectable by appropriateness measurement (Levine & Rubin, 1979). High detection rates have been obtained despite model misspecification and item parameters estimated with error from samples that include substantial proportions of inappropriate response patterns (Levine & Drasgow, 1982). Very high detection rates have been found when response patterns of low ability examinees have been modified to simulate cheating on 20 to 30 percent of the items on an 85 item test and when response patterns of high ability examinees have been modified to simulate spuriously low responding on similar proportions of items (Drasgow, et al., 1985).

The standardized ℓ_0 index (Drasgow et al., 1985), denoted z_3, is easy to compute and has been found to provide relatively powerful detection of inappropriate response patterns. This index is computed from the dichotomously scored item responses, coded $u_i = 1$ if correct and $u_i = 0$ if incorrect, in the following way. First the logarithm of the likelihood function at the maximum likelihood estimate $\hat{\theta}$ of θ, is computed as

$$\ell_0 = \sum [u_i \ln P_i(\hat{\theta}) + (1-u_i) \ln Q_i(\hat{\theta})],$$

where $P_i(\theta)$ is the probability of a correct response among examinees with ability θ and $Q_i(\theta) = 1 - P_i(\theta)$. Then

$$(1) \qquad z_3 = \frac{\ell_0 - M(\hat{\theta})}{[S(\hat{\theta})]^{1/2}},$$

where $M(\hat{\theta})$ and $S(\hat{\theta})$ are the conditional expected value and variance of ℓ_0 given $\theta=\hat{\theta}$, i.e.,

$$M(\hat{\theta}) = \sum [P_i(\hat{\theta}) \ln P_i(\hat{\theta}) + Q_i(\hat{\theta}) \ln Q_i(\hat{\theta})]$$

and

$$S(\hat{\theta}) = \sum P_i(\hat{\theta}) Q_i(\hat{\theta}) \{\ln [P_i(\hat{\theta})/Q_i(\hat{\theta})]\}^2.$$

Although the three-parameter logistic model has been used in our previous research (hence "z_3"), any of the logistic, or normal ogive or other parametric models can be used in the above expressions.

The observed rates of detection of aberrant response patterns found in earlier studies seem to be high enough for practical applications of appropriateness measurement. Nonetheless, we have not yet determined whether an appropriateness index such as the z_3 index is powerful in an absolute sense. More specifically, none of the appropriateness indices compared to z_3 has been found to provide substantially higher rates of detection of spuriously high response patterns. Is this because no such index exists? Does a dramatically superior appropriateness index exist, but remain undiscovered? Comparative studies of available appropriateness indices (Drasgow et al., 1985; Harnisch & Tatsuoka, 1983; Rudner, 1983) cannot answer these fundamental questions.

Optimal Appropriateness Measurement

Means for determining the statistical power of the most powerful appropriateness indices for a given form of aberrance were recently presented by Levine and Drasgow (1984). They denoted the likelihood of a response vector u under a model for normal response patterns such as the three-parameter logistic by $P_{Normal}(u)$ and the likelihood under a model for aberrant response patterns by $P_{Aberrant}(u)$. The Neyman-Pearson Lemma can then be used to show that the highest rate of detection of aberrant response patterns is obtained by classifying u as aberrant when

$$P_{Aberrant}(u) \geq \text{constant } P_{Normal}(u) , \tag{2}$$

where the constant is selected to achieve a specified Type I error rate (i.e., a specified rate of misclassifying normal response patterns as aberrant.)

In many cases it is easy to compute $P_{Normal}(u)$. For example, assume that the item responses are scored dichotomously, $P_i(t)$ is the probability of a positive response on item i among normal examinees with ability t, local independence holds, and the ability density is denoted $f(t)$. Then the conditional likelihood of u given ability t is

$$P_{Normal}(u|t) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} P_i(t)^{u_i} [1-P_i(t)]^{1-u_i} \tag{3}$$

and the unconditional likelihood is

$$P_{Normal}(u) = \int P_{Normal}(u|t)f(t)dt , \tag{4}$$

where the range of integration can be taken as the support of f. When the f and the P_i are smooth functions, the integral in Equation (4) can be easily and accurately approximated using numerical methods.

Levine and Drasgow (1984) showed that $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ can be obtained for some forms of aberrance by taking the conditioning-integrating argument one step further. To illustrate their approach, suppose that the form of aberrance under investigation is the 10% spuriously high condition. Here it is assumed that some examinees are given the answer key to 10% of the test items which, for the statistical analysis, are taken as randomly sampled. The likelihood of u can be written conditioning on both t and a particular 10% of the test items. Then the likelihood $P_{Aberrant}(u|t)$ is determined by averaging all the conditional probabilities obtained by selecting different aberrant items. Finally, $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ is obtained by integration as in Equation (4) or by a quadrature formula.

Direct computation of $P_{Aberrant}(u|t)$ for long tests would be extremely time-consuming. For example, there are about 400 billion ways of choosing 10% of the test items on an 85 item test. Note also that to compute $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ we must evaluate $P_{Aberrant}(u|t)$ for several values of t, so trillions of additions would be required. Of crucial import to the present research is a recursive formula presented by Levine and Drasgow (1984). The formula reduces the number of operations required to evaluate $P_{Aberrant}(u|t)$ to less than one thousand for an 85 item test with 10% of the items spuriously high. Under these conditions, we have found that $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ can usually be computed in less than one tenth of a second of CDC Cyber 175 CPU time, and costs approximately one cent at the University of Illinois.

Although optimal appropriateness indices are reasonably inexpensive to compute on our university mainframe computer they are currently intended only as research tools. Fundamentally different expressions for $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ are obtained for spuriously high and spuriously low response patterns. Furthermore, the expression for $P_{Aberrant}(u)$ for, say, the 10% spuriously high condition with an 85 item test is different from the expression for the 12% spuriously high condition, because the former conditions on the 400 billion ways of choosing 10% of the test items and the latter conditions on the 3 trillion ways of choosing 12% of the test items. Although the recursive formula can be modified to accomodate a distribution of aberrant response types, our goal at this time is to use indices to answer such research questions as:

1. What is the maximum detection rate achievable by appropriateness measurement for the various bench mark types of inappropriateness.
2. How closely do selected practical, multipurpose indices approach the optimal detection rates.
3. Can substantially better appropriateness measurement be achieved by polychotomous indices, i.e. indices that use the information in wrong answers.

Three Problems in Appropriateness Measurement

In the research described in this paper optimal indices are used to examine three questions. First, what are the upper limits on detection rates in appropriateness measurement? An answer to this question is important because it would tell us whether acceptably high detection rates are possible for important forms of aberrance on a given test. If only low rates of detection are possible for some serious forms of aberrance, then it may be prudent to lengthen the test, reduce decision makers' reliance on the test, change the testing process so that the aberrance inducing processes are inhibited (e.g., increase proctoring if copying is a problem), etc.

The second issue studied here concerns the virtues of the z_3 index: How powerful is the z_3 index in relation to the optimal index? If optimal indices provide only slightly higher detection rates, then z_3 would be a good candidate for use in practical settings because it is very easy to compute. In previous studies with dichotomously scored item responses we have found z_3 to provide detection rates that are comparable to the rates obtained by much more sophisticated indices (e.g., Levine & Rubin's (1979) LR index). Nonetheless, these studies do not tell us whether z_3 provides rates of detection that are nearly optimal or whether all the indices under consideration were far from optimal.

The third problem studied concerns the loss of information about aberrance that is incurred when multiple-choice items are scored dichotomously rather than polychotomously. The polychotomous item response models currently available seem less tractable than their dichotomous counterparts. Furthermore there are only a few examples of substantial gains from polychotomous analyses. Can substantial increases in the rates of detection of aberrant response vectors be made via a polychotomous

analysis? Toward this end Drasgow et al. (1985) generalized the z_3 index to the polychotomous case. They expected this new index, labelled z_h, to be superior to z_3 because a polychotomous model provides a more fine-grained description of item responses than a dichotomous model. They found, however, that z_3 provided substantially higher rates of detection for spuriously high response patterns than did z_h. Does any index for the polychotomous data yield markedly higher rates of detection than z_3? Finding an polychotomous model optimal index to be clearly superior to dichotomous model indices (including the dichotomous model optimal index) would underscore the value of polychotomous item response models and the need for better polychotomous model appropriateness indices.

Study 1: Dichotomous Item Responses

Problem: What is the upper limit on the detectability of mildly aberrant response vectors? How close to optimal is the z_3 index?

Method: Three data sets were created. The first was a normal sample of 4000 response vectors. It was generated using three-parameter logistic item characteristic curves with parameters set equal to the item parameter estimates obtained from Levine and Drasgow's (1982) analysis of the 85 item April, 1975 Scholastic Aptitude Test-Verbal section (SAT-V). The ability parameters were randomly sampled from a normal (0,1) distribution truncated to the [-2.05, 2.05] interval.[1] The second sample contained 2000 response vectors subjected to the 10% spuriously high treatment. It was generated by first creating 2000 normal response vectors by the method described above. Then 9 items were randomly selected without replacement from each response vector and rescored as correct. The third sample also contained 2000

response vectors. They were initially created as were the normal response vectors and then they were subjected to the 10% spuriously low treatment. Here 9 items were randomly selected without replacement from each response vector and then each of these items was independently rescored as correct with probability .2 and as incorrect with probability .8.

The three-parameter logistic maximum likelihood estimate of ability was obtained for each response vector. The simulation item parameters were taken to be known quantities. (Levine and Drasgow (1982) showed that values of ℓ_0 computed from estimated item parameters were almost identical to values computed from the actual item parameters. For the optimal index to be truly optimal it must be computed using the actual item parameters.) Then the z_3 index was computed for the response vectors in all three samples. The optimal index for the 10% spuriouly high condition was computed for each response vector in the normal sample and the spuriously high sample by the algorithm described by Levine and Drasgow (1985). The 10% spuriously low optimal index was similarly computed for the spuriously low sample and the normal sample.

Results: Detection rates for various false alarm rates (Type I error rates) for the spuriously high sample are shown in Table 1. It is clear that the z_3 index is close to optimal for the 10% spuriously high treatment: Detection rates for z_3 are about 90% as large as the detection rates for the optimal index at corresponding false alarm rates.

Table 1 also shows that reasonably high detection rates were obtained with the optimal index. For example, 24% of the spuriously high response patterns were detected when the false alarm rate was 5%. These results must be evaluated in light of the fact that on the average the 10% spuriously high treatment changes about four incorrect responses to correct. So the

signal in this context (4 altered item responses) is small relative to the noise (81 item responses not altered).

Insert Table 1 about here

The results for the spuriously low treatment are shown in Table 2. The detection rates for the 10% spuriously low optimal index are somewhat lower here than the rates for the 10% spuriously high optimal index shown in Table 1. Detection rates for z_3 show larger decreases from Table 1 to Table 2. Consequently, detection rates for z_3 are not very close to optimal; at low false alarm rates z_3 detects only about 65% as many spuriously low response vectors as the optimal index.

Insert Table 2 about here

Study 2: Polychotomous Item Responses

Problem: Is our power to detect aberrant response patterns substantially diminished when multiple-choice items are scored dichotomously?

Method: Again three data sets were generated: 4000 normal response patterns, 2000 normal response patterns subjected to the 10% spuriously high treatment, and 2000 normal response patterns subjected to the 10% spuriously low treatment. In this study, however, polychotomous responses (five option multiple-choice items with omitting allowed) were simulated using the histograms constructed by Levine and Drasgow (1983). They estimated abilities for 49,470 examinees from the April, 1975 administration of the

SAT-V, formed 25 ability groups by using the 4th, 8th, ..., 96th percentile points from the normal distribution, and then determined the frequency of option selection (treating skipped and not reached items as a single response category) for each ability group. Probabilities of option responses were then computed by linear interpolations between ability catagory medians (i.e., the 2nd, 6th, ..., 98th percentile points from the normal distribution). Abilities were randomly sampled from the normal (0,1) distribution truncated to the [-2.05, 2.05] interval (because we could not interpolate below the 2nd percentile or above the 98th percentile). Finally, the spuriously high treatment was performed exactly as in Study 1. In the spuriously low treatment, each of the five options were selected with probability .2. Omitted responses were never modified in the spuriously low treatment nor counted toward the total of 9 items.

The polychotomous generalization z_h of z_3 was then computed for each response vector. The requisite quantities for z_h are

$$\ell_h = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{6} \delta_j(v_i) \log P_{ij}(\hat{\theta})$$

$$M(\hat{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{6} P_{ij}(\hat{\theta}) \log P_{ij}(\hat{\theta}) ,$$

and

$$S_h(\hat{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \{ \sum_{j=1}^{6} \sum_{k=1}^{6} P_{ij}(\hat{\theta}) P_{ik}(\hat{\theta}) \log P_{ij}(\hat{\theta}) \log[P_{ij}(\hat{\theta})/P_{ik}(\hat{\theta})]\}$$

Here v_i denotes the response to the ith item, coded $v_i=1$ for option A, ..., $v_i=5$ for option E, and $v_i=6$ for omit, $P_{ij}(\hat{\theta})$ denotes the histogram probability of $v_i=j$ at ability $\hat{\theta}$, and $\delta_j(v_i) = 1$ if $v_i=j$

and 0 otherwise. Since the histogram model likelihood function does not have a continuous first derivation and is therefore difficult to maximize, three-parameter logistic ability estimates (with the restriction $-2.05 \leq (\hat{\theta}) \leq 2.05$) were used in the above equations. The polychotomous model optimal index for the 10% spuriously high treatment was computed for the normal and spuriously high samples and the optimal index for the 10% spuriuosly low treatment was computed for the normal and spuriously low samples.

In many applications multiple-choice item responses are scored dichotomously. To determine the effects on approriateness measurement of this simplification of the data, the item responses were scored dichotomously, and then z_3 and the three-parameter logistic optimal index were computed. Note that the three-parameter logistic optimal indices are not truly optimal in these analyses because the model used to analyze the data (the three-parameter logistic model) is not identical to the model used to create the data (the histogram model).

Results: Table 3 presents the results for the 10% spuriously high condition. This table shows why the detection rates of spuriously high response vectors by z_3 were found to be much higher than the rates for z_h in the Drasgow et al. (1985) study: z_h is a very ineffectual index for detecting spuriously high response patterns. At low false alarm rates the z_h index yields detection rates only about a quarter to a third as high as the rates for the polychotomous model optimal index. In contrast the detection rates for z_3 are about 65% of optimal.

Table 3 also shows that the three-parameter logistic model optimal index yielded detection rates that were roughly 75% as large as the rates for the truly optimal polychotomous model index. Thus polychotomous scoring

of simulated multiple-choice item responses allows moderately higher rates of detection of spuriously high response vectors.

Insert Table 3 about here

Table 4 presents the results for the 10% spuriously low condition. Here the polychotomous model optimal index detects almost 41% of the aberrant response vectors at a 5% false alarm rate. This high detection rate is obtained because the spuriously low modification changes more responses here than in the dichotomous case. In particular, the spuriously low treatment can change an incorrect response that is appropriate (i.e., the favorite distractor at the examinee's ability t) to an incorrect response that is inappropriate (i.e., a distractor rarely selected by examinees with abilities near t).

Table 4 shows that dichotomous scoring seriously reduces the detectability of spuriously low response vectors: The three-parameter logistic optimal index has detection rates substantially lower than the polychotomous model optimal index. At a 1% false alarm rate, the three-parameter logistic optimal index detects less than half as many aberrant response vectors as does the polychotomous model optimal index.

Insert Table 4 about here

It is also evident in Table 4 that neither the z_3 nor the z_h index is particularly effective. Both of these indices have detection rates that are only about 40% as large as the optimal index at low false alarm rates.

Note, however, that z_3 is relatively effective vis-a-vis the dichotomous model optimal index.

Discussion

In the studies described here we deliberately choose forms of aberrance that have been difficult to detect with non-optimal appropriateness indices (see Levine & Rubin, 1979, and Drasgow, et al., 1985). If we had selected forms of aberrance that were easy to detect such as the 30% spuriously high and low treatments, there would have been little improvement possible. The forms of aberrance studied here certainly allowed for improvement on the detection rates of the z_3 and z_h indices.

Our results indicate that optimal indices perform slightly to dramatically better than previously studied indices. The least improvement was found for truly dichotomous response vectors subjected to the spuriously high manipulation. In this condition the z_3 index yielded detection rates roughly 85% to 90% as large as possible. It seems reasonable to conclude that the z_3 index is satisfactory for this situation. The z_3 index is less satisfactory for detecting response vectors that were generated by the three-parameter logistic model and then subjected to the spuriously low treatment. At low false alarm rates, z_3 detects about 65% as many aberrant response vectors as detected by the optimal index.

When item responses are created to simulate a multiple-choice test (in particular, the SAT-V), optimal appropriateness measurement using the polychotomous form of the items provides substantially improved rates of detection. The most striking results were obtained in the spuriously low condition where both the z_3 and z_h indices were clearly unsatisfactory. There are two implications of this result. First, it clearly shows that

appropriateness measurement is one practical testing problem where substantial gains can be made through the use of polychotomous item response models. The second implication of our research is that further work is needed on practical appropriateness indices based on polychotomous models. It is clear that z_h is less than satisfactory for detecting spuriously high response patterns on multiple-choice tests.

In summary, our results show that moderately high detection rates can be obtained for mildly aberrant response patterns. The rates of detection are higher for polychotomous item responses than for dichotomous item responses. The z_3 index is close to optimal for dichotomous item responses subjected to the spuriously high treatment but it is less satisfactory when dichotomous item responses are subjected to the spuriously low treatment. Finally, detection rates were substantially lower when simulated multiple-choice items were analyzed dichotomously. These results emphasize the importance of developing powerful, practical polychotomous model indices.

References

Drasgow, F. (1982). Choice of test model for appropriateness measurement. Applied Psychological Measurement, 6, 297-308.

Drasgow, F., Levine, M. V., & Williams, E. A. (1985). Appropriateness measurement with polychotomous item response models and standardized indices. British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 38 67-86.

Harnisch, D. L. & Tatsuoka, K. K. (1983). A comparison of appropriateness indices based on item response theory. In R. Hambleton (Ed.), Applications of item response theory. Vancouver: ERIBC.

Levine, M. V. (1985). Multilinear formula scoring: Estimation of option characteristic curves. Manuscript in preparation.

Levine, M. V. & Drasgow, F. (1982). Appropriateness measurement: Review, critique, and validating studies. British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 35, 42-56.

Levine, M. V. & Drasgow, F. (1983). The relation between incorrect option choice and estimated ability. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 43, 675-685.

Levine, M. V. & Drasgow, F. (1984). Performance envelopes and optimal appropriateness measurement. Manuscript under review. (Available as Measurement Series 84-5 from Model-Based Measurement Laboratory, 210 Education Building, Department of Educational Psychology, University of Illinois, 1310 S. Sixth Street, Champaign, IL 61820.)

Levine, M. V. & Rubin, D. B. (1979). Measuring the appropriateness of multiple-choice test scores. Journal of Educational Statistics, 4, 269-289.

Rudner, L. M. (1983). Individual assessment accuracy. Journal of Educational Measurement, 20, 207-219.

Tatsuoka, K. K. (1984). Caution indices based on item response theory. Psychometrika, 49, 95-110.

Footnote

This research was supported by ONR contracts N00014-79C-0752, NR 154-445 and N00014-83K-0397, NR 150 518, Michael V. Levine, Principal Investigator.

1. The ability distribution was truncated so that the results of Study 1 would be more comparable to the results of Study 2.

Table 1

Detection Rates for Response Vectors Generated by the Three-Parameter Logistic Model, 10% Spuriously High Treatment

Proportion of Normals Misclassified	Proportion Detected by Optimal Index	Proportion Detected by z_3	Ratio of Detection Rates
.01	.090	.087	.97
.02	.144	.120	.83
.03	.175	.148	.85
.04	.199	.179	.90
.05	.242	.202	.83
.06	.258	.220	.85
.08	.302	.278	.92
.10	.342	.308	.90
.15	.446	.388	.87
.20	.530	.453	.86
.25	.599	.510	.85

Note: Item responses were generated for 2000 simulated spuriously high examinees and 4000 simulated normal examinees.

Table 2

Detection Rates of Response Vectors Generated by the Three-Parameter Logistic Model, 10% Spuriously Low Treatment

Proportion of Normals Misclassified	Proportion Detected by Optimal Index	Proportion Detected by z_3	Ratio of Detection Rates
.01	.076	.046	.61
.02	.100	.065	.65
.03	.130	.079	.61
.04	.150	.097	.64
.05	.170	.114	.67
.06	.181	.126	.70
.08	.210	.160	.76
.10	.234	.187	.80
.15	.312	.250	.80
.20	.376	.314	.83
.25	.444	.372	.84

Note: Item responses were generated for 2000 simulated spuriously low examinees and 4000 simulated normal examinees.

Table 3

Detection Rates for Response Vectors Generated by the Histogram Model, 10% Spuriously High Treatment

Proportion of Normals Misclassified	Appropriateness Index			
	EC_h	z_h	EC_3	z_3
.01	.130	.032 (.25)	.087 (.67)	.082 (.63)
.02	.194	.056 (.28)	.144 (.74)	.121 (.62)
.03	.244	.073 (.30)	.184 (.75)	.154 (.63)
.04	.282	.090 (.32)	.223 (.79)	.183 (.65)
.05	.330	.108 (.33)	.256 (.78)	.204 (.62)
.06	.356	.125 (.35)	.282 (.79)	.230 (.65)
.08	.402	.155 (.39)	.343 (.85)	.270 (.67)
.10	.442	.197 (.45)	.380 (.86)	.317 (.72)
.15	.520	.272 (.52)	.488 (.94)	.400 (.77)
.20	.591	.352 (.60)	.556 (.94)	.482 (.82)
.25	.667	.410 (.61)	.620 (.93)	.547 (.82)

Note: Item responses were generated for 2000 simulated spuriously high examinees and 4000 simulated normal examinees. EC_h = optimal histogram appropriateness index; EC_3 = optimal three-parameter logistic appropriateness index. Each number in parenthesis is the ratio of a nonoptimal index's hit rate and the optimal index's hit rate.

Table 4

Detection Rates for Response Vectors Generated by the Histogram Model, 10% Spuriously Low Treatment

Proportion of Normals Misclassified	Appropriateness Index			
	EC_h	z_h	EC_3	z_3
.01	.231	.069 (.30)	.114 (.49)	.083 (.36)
.02	.298	.108 (.36)	.168 (.56)	.114 (.38)
.03	.344	.138 (.40)	.196 (.57)	.148 (.43)
.04	.381	.160 (.42)	.238 (.62)	.174 (.46)
.05	.406	.184 (.45)	.260 (.64)	.192 (.47)
.06	.438	.218 (.50)	.272 (.62)	.218 (.50)
.08	.504	.266 (.53)	.312 (.62)	.256 (.51)
.10	.546	.314 (.58)	.353 (.65)	.292 (.54)
.15	.640	.400 (.63)	.454 (.61)	.386 (.60)
.20	.706	.471 (.67)	.540 (.76)	.454 (.64)
.25	.758	.540 (.71)	.598 (.79)	.514 (.68)

Note: Item responses were generated for 2000 simulated spuriously low examinees and 4000 simulated normal examinees. EC_h = optimal histogram appropriateness index; EC_3 = optimal three-parameter logistic appropriateness index. Each number in parenthesis is the ratio of a nonoptimal index's hit rate and the optimal index's hit rate.

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Phillip L. Ackerman
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Personnel Analysis Division,
AF/MPXA
5C360, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Air Force Human Resources Lab
AFHRL/MPD
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

AFOSR,
Life Sciences Directorate
Bolling Air Force Base
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. Robert Ahlers
Code N711
Human Factors Laboratory
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. James Algina
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32605

Dr. Erling B. Andersen
Department of Statistics
Studiestraede 6
1455 Copenhagen
DENMARK

Dr. Phipps Arabie
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Technical Director, ARI
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Patricia Baggett
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Box 345
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Isaac Bejar
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08450

Arthur S. Blaiwes
Code N711
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. R. Darrell Bock
University of Chicago
Department of Education
Chicago, IL 60637

Cdt. Arnold Bohrer
Sectie Psychologisch Onderzoek
Rekruterings-En Selectiecentrum
Kwartier Koningen Astrid
Bruijnstraat
1120 Brussels, BELGIUM

Dr. Nick Bond
Office of Naval Research
Liaison Office, Far East
APO San Francisco, CA 96503

Dr. Robert Breaux
Code N-095R
NAVTRAEQUIPCEN
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert Brennan
American College Testing
Programs
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Patricia A. Butler
NIE Mail Stop 1806
1200 19th St., NW
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Ernest R. Cadotte
307 Stokely
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

Mr. James W. Carey
Commandant (G-PTE)
U.S. Coast Guard
2100 Second Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20593

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. James Carlson
American College Testing
Program
P.O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. John B. Carroll
409 Elliott Rd.
Chapel Hill, NC 27514

Dr. Robert Carroll
NAVOP 01B7
Washington, DC 20370

Mr. Raymond E. Christal
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Norman Cliff
Department of Psychology
Univ. of So. California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Director,
Manpower Support and
Readiness Program
Center for Naval Analysis
2000 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Scientific Advisor
to the DCNO (MPT)
Center for Naval Analysis
2000 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Assistant Chief of Staff
for Research, Development,
Test, and Evaluation
Naval Education and
Training Command (N-5)
NAS Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. Stanley Collyer
Office of Naval Technology
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217

Dr. Hans Crombag
University of Leyden
Education Research Center
Boerhaavelaan 2
2334 EN Leyden
The NETHERLANDS

CTB/McGraw-Hill Library
2500 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

CDR Mike Curran
Office of Naval Research
800 N. Quincy St.
Code 270
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Mr. Timothy Davey
University of Illinois
Educational Psychology
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Dattprasad Divgi
Syracuse University
Department of Psychology
Syracuse, NY 13210

Dr. Hei-Ki Dong
Ball Foundation
800 Roosevelt Road
Building C, Suite 206
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Dr. Fritz Drasgow
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Defense Technical
Information Center
Cameron Station, Bldg 5
Alexandria, VA 22314
Attn: TC
(12 Copies)

Dr. Stephen Dunbar
Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Kent Eaton
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. John M. Eddins
University of Illinois
252 Engineering Research
Laboratory
103 South Mathews Street
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. John Ellis
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92252

Dr. Susan Embretson
University of Kansas
Psychology Department
Lawrence, KS 66045

ERIC Facility-Acquisitions
4833 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. Benjamin A. Fairbank
Performance Metrics, Inc.
5825 Callaghan
Suite 225
San Antonio, TX 78228

Dr. Pat Federico
Code 511
NPRDC
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Leonard Feldt
Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Gerhard Fischer
Liebiggasse 5/3
A 1010 Vienna
AUSTRIA

Dr. Myron Fischl
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Prof. Donald Fitzgerald
University of New England
Department of Psychology
Armidale, New South Wales 2351
AUSTRALIA

Mr. Paul Foley
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Alfred R. Fregly
AFOSR/NL
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Bob Frey
Commandant (G-P-1/2)
USCG HQ
Washington, DC 20593

Dr. Robert D. Gibbons
University of Illinois-Chicago
P.O. Box 6998
Chicago, IL 69680

Dr. Janice Gifford
University of Massachusetts
School of Education
Amherst, MA 01002

Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research
& Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Bert Green
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

H. William Greenup
Education Advisor (E031)
Education Center, MCDEC
Quantico, VA 22134

Dr. Ronald K. Hambleton
Laboratory of Psychometric and
Evaluative Research
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Delwyn Harnisch
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Ms. Rebecca Hetter
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Paul W. Holland
Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Paul Horst
677 G Street, #184
Chula Vista, CA 90010

Dr. Lloyd Humphreys
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 East Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Steven Hunka
Department of Education
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA

Dr. Huynh Huynh
College of Education
Univ. of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Douglas H. Jones
Advanced Statistical
Technologies Corporation
10 Trafalgar Court
Lawrenceville, NJ 08148

Prof. John A. Keats
Department of Psychology
University of Newcastle
N.S.W. 2308
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Norman J. Kerr
Chief of Naval Education
and Training
Code 00A2
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. G. Gage Kingsbury
Portland Public Schools
Research and Evaluation Department
501 North Dixon Street
P. O. Box 3107
Portland, OR 97209-3107

Dr. William Koch
University of Texas-Austin
Measurement and Evaluation
Center
Austin, TX 78703

Dr. Leonard Kroeker
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Patrick Kyllonen
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Anita Lancaster
Accession Policy
OASD/MI&L/MP&FM/AP
Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Daryll Lang
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Thomas Leonard
University of Wisconsin
Department of Statistics
1210 West Dayton Street
Madison, WI 53705

Dr. Michael Levine
Educational Psychology
210 Education Bldg.
University of Illinois
Champaign, IL 61801

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Charles Lewis
Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Oude Boteringestraat 23
9712GC Groningen
The NETHERLANDS

Dr. Robert Linn
College of Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Robert Lockman
Center for Naval Analysis
200 North Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. Frederic M. Lord
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. James Lumsden
Department of Psychology
University of Western Australia
Nedlands W.A. 6009
AUSTRALIA

Dr. William L. Maloy
Chief of Naval Education
and Training
Naval Air Station
Pensacola, FL 32508

Dr. Gary Marco
Stop 31-E
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08451

Dr. Kneale Marshall
Operations Research Department
Naval Post Graduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Clessen Martin
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Blvd.
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. James McBride
Psychological Corporation
c/o Harcourt, Brace,
Javanovich Inc.
1250 West 6th Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Dr. Clarence McCormick
HQ, MEPCOM
MEPCT-P
2500 Green Bay Road
North Chicago, IL 60064

Mr. Robert McKinley
University of Toledo
Department of Educational Psychology
Toledo, OH 43606

Dr. Barbara Means
Human Resources
Research Organization
1100 South Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Robert Mislevy
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. William Montague
NPRDC Code 13
San Diego, CA 92152

Ms. Kathleen Moreno
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152

Headquarters, Marine Corps
Code MPI-20
Washington, DC 20380

Program Manager for Manpower,
Personnel, and Training,
NAVMAT 0722
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Assistant for MPT Research,
Development and Studies
NAVOP 01B7
Washington, DC 20370

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. W. Alan Nicewander
University of Oklahoma
Department of Psychology
Oklahoma City, OK 73069

Dr. William E. Nordbrock
FMC-ADCO Box 25
APO, NY 09710

Dr. Melvin R. Novick
356 Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Director, Manpower and Personnel
Laboratory,
NPRDC (Code 06)
San Diego, CA 92152

Library, NPRDC
Code P201L
San Diego, CA 92152

Commanding Officer,
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 2627
Washington, DC 20390

Dr. Harry F. O'Neil, Jr.
Training Research Lab
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. James Olson
WICAT, Inc.
1875 South State Street
Orem, UT 84057

Office of Naval Research,
Code 442PT
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
(6 Copies)

Special Assistant for Marine
Corps Matters,
ONR Code 100M
800 N. Quincy St.
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Judith Orasanu
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Jesse Orlansky
Institute for Defense Analyses
1801 N. Beauregard St.
Alexandria, VA 22311

Wayne M. Patience
American Council on Education
GED Testing Service, Suite 20
One Dupont Circle, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dr. James Paulson
Department of Psychology
Portland State University
P.O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Dr. Roger Pennell
Air Force Human Resources
Laboratory
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Administrative Sciences Department,
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Department of Operations Research,
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Department of Computer Science,
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Mark D. Reckase
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Malcolm Ree
AFHRL/MP
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Thomas Reynolds
University of Texas-Dallas
Marketing Department
P. O. Box 688
Richardson, TX 75080

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Mary S. Riley
Program in Cognitive Science
Center for Human Information Processing
University of California
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Carl Ross
CNET-PDCD
Building 90
Great Lakes NTC, IL 60088

Mr. Robert Ross
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Donald Rubin
Statistics Department
Science Center, Room 608
1 Oxford Street
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Lawrence Rudner
403 Elm Avenue
Takoma Park, MD 20012

Dr. J. Ryan
Department of Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Fumiko Samejima
Department of Psychology
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37916

Mr. Drew Sands
NPRDC Code 62
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Robert Sasmor
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Walter Schneider
University of Illinois
Psychology Department
603 E. Daniel
Champaign, IL 61820

Lowell Schoer
Psychological & Quantitative Foundations
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Dr. Mary Schratz
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. W. Steve Sellman
OASD(MRA&L)
2B269 The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301

Dr. Joyce Shields
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Edwin Shirkey
University of Central Florida
Department of Psychology
Orlando, FL 32816

Dr. William Sims
Center for Naval Analysis
200 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Manpower Research and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
801 North Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Alfred F. Smode
Senior Scientist
Code 7B
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Richard Snow
Liaison Scientist
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office, London
Box 39
FPO New York, NY 09510

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Richard Sorensen
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Paul Speckman
University of Missouri
Department of Statistics
Columbia, MO 65201

Martha Stocking
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Peter Stoloff
Center for Naval Analysis
200 North Beauregard Street
Alexandria, VA 22311

Dr. William Stout
University of Illinois
Department of Mathematics
Urbana, IL 61801

Maj. Bill Strickland
AF/MPXOA
4E168 Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330

Dr. Patrick Suppes
Stanford University
Institute for Mathematical
Studies in the Social Sciences
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Hariharan Swaminathan
Laboratory of Psychometric and
Evaluation Research
School of Education
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Mr. Brad Sympson
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. John Tangney
AFOSR/NL
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka
CERL
252 Engineering Research
Laboratory
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Maurice Tatsuoka
220 Education Bldg
1310 S. Sixth St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. David Thissen
Department of Psychology
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66044

Mr. Gary Thomasson
University of Illinois
Educational Psychology
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Robert Tsutakawa
Department of Statistics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201

Dr. Ledyard Tucker
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. James Tweeddale
Technical Director
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. V. R. R. Uppuluri
Union Carbide Corporation
Nuclear Division
P. O. Box Y
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Dr. Vern W. Urry
Personnel R&D Center
Office of Personnel Management
1900 E. Street, NW
Washington, DC 20415

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. David Vale
Assessment Systems Corp.
2233 University Avenue
Suite 310
St. Paul, MN 55114

Dr. Frank Vicino
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Howard Wainer
Division of Psychological Studies
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Ming-Mei Wang
Lindquist Center
for Measurement
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Mr. Thomas A. Warm
Coast Guard Institute
P. O. Substation 18
Oklahoma City, OK 73169

Dr. Brian Waters
Program Manager
Manpower Analysis Program
HumRRO
1100 S. Washington St.
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Edward Wegman
Office of Naval Research
Code 411
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. David J. Weiss
N660 Elliott Hall
University of Minnesota
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Ronald A. Weitzman
NPS, Code 54Wz
Monterey, CA 92152

Major John Welsh
AFHRL/MOAN
Brooks AFB, TX 78223

Dr. Douglas Wetzel
Code 12
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Rand R. Wilcox
University of Southern
California
Department of Psychology
Los Angeles, CA 90007

German Military Representative
ATTN: Wolfgang Wildegrube
Streitkraefteamt
D-5300 Bonn 2
4000 Brandywine Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Bruce Williams
Department of Educational
Psychology
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Hilda Wing
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333

Ms. Marilyn Wingersky
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Mr. John H. Wolfe
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. George Wong
Biostatistics Laboratory
Memorial Sloan-Kettering
Cancer Center
1275 York Avenue
New York, NY 10021

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152

DISTRIBUTION LIST FOR University of Illinois/Levine (NR 150-518)

Dr. Wendy Yen
CTB/McGraw Hill
Del Monte Research Park
Monterey, CA 93940

Dr. Joseph L. Young
Memory & Cognitive
Processes
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550